

Sandy Foundation

SHAKEN:

Those so generally believed and applauded DOCTRINES,

Of { One God, subsisting in three distinct and
separate Persons,
The impossibility of pardoning sin-
ners, without satisfaction,
The justification of sinners by an
imputative Righteousness } Refuted

From the Authority of Scripture Testimonies, and right Reason.

By W. J.

A Builder on that Foundation which cannot be moved.

*But to us there is but one God, the Father of all things, 1 Cor. 8. 6.
Who is a God like unto thee, who telleth iniquity? He retaineth
not his anger for ever, because he delighteth in mercy, Mic. 7. 18.
For I will not punish the wicked, Exod. 23. 7.*

Printed in the Year, 1668.



To the Unprejudiced Reader.

IT was the fault of some in antient times, that they made void God's Law by mens Traditions: and certainly I may now assume the same complaint: for whilst I take a serious prospect of the Spiritual Nature, and tendency of the Second Covenant, which God Almighty, in the fulness of time, by his Prophets, prophesied to make and perfect: and also the accomplishment thereof by Jesus Christ, and what was brought to pass amongst those Primitive Believers: methinks I do not only see an utter abolishment of Ceremonial Worship, but the inscribing that Spiritual Law on the Heart, and infusion of Holy Fear to the inward Parts, whereby each person became capacitated to know the will of God, as suited with his present state: from an infallible inspiration in himself, and not on the slender grounds of mens Lo-bere-Interpretations, or Lo-there: for the Kingdom of God is within, where himself must be the Teacher of his People: But on the other hand, when from the noise of every parties pretensions to, and contentions for their own way, as most infallible, I am induced to an impartial examination of them: Alas! how have all adulterated from the purity both of Scripture Record, and Primitive Example? receiving for unquestionable Doctrines, the fallible apprehensions, and uncertain determinations of such Councils, whose Faction, Prejudice, and Cruelty soon parallel'd the foregoing heathenish Persecutions: and yet that the results of persons so incompetently qualified should at this day in their authority remain unquestioned by the Nations, is matter both of astonishment and pity: but an implicit Faith has ever been

To the Unprejudiced Reader.

the consequence of ignorance, idleness and fear, being strong impediments to a judicious inquiry, how far profess and imposed Opinions have their consistency with Reason, and the true Religion. But that which most of all deserves a lamentation, is, that Protestants, whose better Arguments have confuted the Plea of such as made Tradition, and mens Prescriptions unquestionable in Circumstantials, should themselves by Print and Practice so openly declare and contend for its Authority in Essentials: as must be obvious to any that observe their zealous Anathema's against whomsoever refuse a compliance with them in Doctrines, manifestly bottom'd upon mens nice Inventions.

This is the right state of the Controversie that is maintained by us (contemptibly called Quakers) against the World, and the undoubted reason of our severe Treatment at its hands, the end of God Almightyes raising us, being for no other purpose than to declare that which our eyes have seen, our ears heard, and which our hands have handled of the Eternal Word, in opposition to the private Opinions, Conjectures, and Interpretations of men concerning God and Religion, that all people might thereby be reduced to Faith in, and obedience of the Universal Grace which brings Salvation: which as it onely can restore sound Judgment concerning God, and effect Redemption from Iniquity, so its being relinquish'd by men, was the very ground both of their division in Judgment, and corruption in Manners.

That this hath been, and in our case, I shall produce an instance, which is indeed the occasion of this Treatise.

Two Persons lately of Tho. Vincent's Auditory in Spittle-Yard, (who goes under the notion of a Presbyter) being desirous to prove all things, and hold fast the fast, visited our Meetings, to understand if we were as really deserving blame, as represented by our Enemies: where it then pleased Divine Goodness

To the Unpious and Worldly Reader.

went to visit them with the Call of his Light, from the Inventions, carnal Observations, vain-Worship, and vain Conversation of those to whom they formerly were related, that they might be made Children of the day; and though its appearance might be small, yet sufficient to discover them to have been Inhabitants of the Night, and can never be rejected; but it shall bring that condemnation which will further testify it to be of God.

But in relinquishing his Congregation, so indent'd this Presbyterian Preacher, as that his pious Zeal transported him beyond, not only the moderation of Christianity, but the civility of education, venting his folly and prejudice much to this purpose, That he had as lieve they should go to a Bawdy-house, as to frequent the Quakers Meeting, because of their erroneous and damnable Doctrines. And pointing to the Window, said, If there should stand a Cup of Poyson, I would rather drink it, than suck in their damnable Doctrines. He further express'd himself in this manner to one of them, If ever you go again, I will give you up, and God will give you up, that you may believe a lie, and be damn'd. Which storms of foul and railing accusations, proving ineffectual to shipwreck that little grain of Faith, his Hearers, as forgetting they hold their preaching by connivance, and the many appeals made by their non-conforming Brethren, for an Indulgence, came with this Caution to the Pater-Familias, (or he that was both Husband and Father to the concerned Parties) that he would exercise his Authority, as well to refuse them to all Quaker-Visitants, as prohibit them the liberty of their Consciences in frequenting our Meetings.

All which we could not for the Truth-sake let pass in silence, and therefore did require him to let us have a publick meeting, in which we might have liberty to answer on the behalf both of our selves and Principles: which after some demur, was granted,

To the Unprejudiced Reader

ted, the day he appointed, and at the second hour in the afternoon. But that he might not want the applause of many voices, and doubtless to prevent our Friends, (as I am informed) he spoke his usual Auditory to be there at one, and as a man that would not over spend himself, or incur a non-plus for want of Seconds, he had his Third and Fourth, two viz. Tho. Danson, Tho. Doogirel, and — Madlocks, who at their times (and often out of them) did interpose, so whom Geo. Whitehead mostly answered & we had there any thing been spoken by another, but from their own example.

The matter in controversy will be related in the beginning of this Treatise, as a necessary Preamble, or Introduction to the following Discourse. The manner of it was so gross, that I know not how to represent it better, than by the levity and rudeness of some Praise, Laughing, Flissing, Shooing, Striking, and signifying us with the opprobrious terms of Confident Fellows, impudent Killers, Blasphemers, &c. And as the usual refuge of shallow Reasoners (when they have little else to say, or prepossess their Hearers with prejudice against the Principles of such as do oppose them) he questioned much whether I was not some Jesuite. Not remembering, or at least unwilling to let the people know, that none have been, nor are more instant in the vindication of that Doctrine he and his Brethren did assert, (to wit, God subsisting in three distinct persons) than the Jesuites. So that, if it should not as well reflect a scandal upon their learning by a comparison, as he did upon my Principle, I could more truly impute Jesuitism upon himself. In short, they neither would keep to Scripture terms themselves, nor suffer it in others: but looking upon G. Whitehead's explanation of their Terms, and reduction of their Matter (if possible) to a Scripture sense (thereby fixing it to the Auditories apprehension) to be an indirect way of answer-
ing

To the Unprejudiced Reader.

ing, (and that which naturally did engage their credulity) all folly to the vulgar) T. V. in an abrupt manner fell to his prayer, in which he falsely, and with many strongly affected whines, accused us for Blasphemy unto God: and that he might prevent the clearing of our selves, he desired the people, when he had finish'd, to be gone, giving them an example by his and three Brethren retreat: But we being desirous further to inform the people of our innocency, they did not only (yet before) endeavour'd pull us down, but put the Councillors, (though several persons of good esteem, and honour, whilst we spoke in vindication of our selves, from the impositions of our Adversaries).

The people still remaining undispers'd, T. V. came very palely down the Stairs (holding a Candle in his hand) requesting their dismiss: at which time he promised us, at our request, another meeting: but as our time was not well what he said, or never purpos'd to perform what he promis'd, has given us since to understand, he can't in Conscience spare us so much time: yet to satisfy G. W. and his self, in private, he could agree: which surely can't be a second meeting, since then it must relate to the preceding one: But how near the relation is betwixt an accusation before hundreds, and a satisfaction before none, must needs be obvious to every unbiass'd person: Our Right should have been altogether as publick as our Wrong: For which cause we were necessitated to visit his Rectory: where on a Lecture day (after a continued silence during all his Worship) we modestly intreated we might be cleared from those unjust reflections before his Congregation, leaving a Disputation (if he could not then attend it) to some more seasonable opportunity: But as one, who resolv'd injustice to his reputation, we with our countenances in banking a defence of his own Principles, he slunk most shamefully away: nor would any there, though urg'd to it, assume his place to vindicate

To the Unprejudiced Reader.

dicare his prædicatione towards us, or his Doctrine then deliver'd.

Reader, What's thy Opinion of this savage entertainment? Would Socrates, Cato, or Seneca have treated us with such unseemly carriage, whom they call Heathens? I suppose not? And well it is for the truly sober and conscientious, they are not lyable to those severe dashes, and that peevish usage, which are the inseparable Appendices to a Scotch Directory, whose cold and cutting gales ever have design'd to nip and blast the fairest Blossoms of greater Reformation. So much for History.

And what remains, is to inform the Reader, that with great brevity I have disscuss and endeavour'd a total enervation of those Cardinal Points, and chief Doctrines so firmly believed, and continually impos'd for Articles of Christian Faith: 1. The Trinity of separate Persons, in the Unity of Essence. 2. God's incapacity to forgive without the fullest satisfaction paid him by another. 3. A justification of impure persons, from an imputative Righteousness. Which Principles, let me tell thee, Reader, are not more repugnant to Scriptures, Reason, and Souls Security, than most destructive to Gods Honour, in his Unity, Mercy, and Purity.

Therefore I beseech thee to exterminate passion from her pre-dominacy, in the perusal of this abridg'd Discourse, since it was writ in love to thee; that whilst 'tis thy desire to know Love, and fear God Almighty above mens Precepts, thou mayest not miss so good an end, by the blind embraces of Tradition for Truth. But in the nobility of a true Berean, search and inquire; letting the good old Verity, not a pretended Antiquity, (whilst a meer novelty;) and solid Reason, not an over-fond credulity, sway the balance of thy Judgment, that both stability and certainty may accompany thy determinations. Farewel.

Al

A short Confutation, by way of Recapitulation, of what was objected against us at Thomas Vincent his Meeting.

IF Disputations prove at any time ineffectual, it's either to be imputed to the ignorance and ambiguity of the Disputants, or to the rudeness and prejudice of the Auditory; all which may truly be affirmed of T. V. with his three Brethren, and Congregation.

The Accusation being general, *viz.* *That the Quakers held damnable Doctrines:* George Whitehead on their behalf stood up, and as it was his place, willingly would have given the people an information of our Principles, which if objected against, he was as ready to attest them by the authority of Scripture and Reason: but instead of this better Method, T. V. as one that's often employ'd in Catechistical Lectures, falls to Interrogatories, begging that himself, he in his slander had taken for granted, to wit, the knowledge of our Principles.

The Question was this, *Whether we own'd one God-head, subsisting in three distinct and separate Persons,* as the result of various reviles and amendments; which being denyed by us, as a Doctrine no where Scriptural, T. V. frames this Sylogism from the beloved Disciples words.

There are three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, John 5. and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one. 7.

These are either three Manifestations, three Operations, three Substances, or three somethings else besides Substances:

But they are not three Manifestations, three Operations, three Substances, nor three anythings else besides Substances:

Ergo, Three Substances.

G. W. utterly rejected his terms, as not to be found in Scripture, nor deducible from the place he instanced; wherefore he desires their explanation of their Terms, inasmuch as God did not use to wrap his Truths up in Heathenish Metaphisicks, but in plain Language: Notwithstanding we could not give a better explanation then Person, nor of Person, than the mode of a Substance; to all which *G. W.* and my self urged several Scriptures, proving Gods compleat unity: And when we queried how God was to be understood, if in an abstractive sense from his Substance; They concluded it a point more fit for Admiration than Disputation. But a little to review his Syllogism; the manner of it shows him as little a Scholar, as its matter does a Christian; but I shall overlook the first, and so much of the second as might deserve my Objection to his Major, and give in short my Reason, why I haaly deny his Minor Proposition. No one Substance can have three distinct Substances, and preserve its own Unity; for grasping them the most favourable definition, every substance will have its own Substance; so that three distinct Substances, or manner of beings, will require three distinct Substances or Beings; consequently three Gods: for if the infinite God-head subsists in three separate manners or forms, then is not any one of them a perfect and compleat substance without the other two; so parts, and something finite is in God: or if infinite, then three distinct infinite Substances; and what's this but to assert three Gods, since none is infinite but God? And on the contrary, there being an inseparability betwixt the Substance and its substance, the Unity of Substance will not admit a Trinity of incommunicable or distinct Substances.

T. D. being ask'd of whom was Christ the express Image, from his alleading that Scripture in the *Hebrews*; answered, of Gods Substance, or manner of being; from whence two things in short follow as my Reply, It makes God a Father only by substance, and Christ a Son without a Substance. Besides its falsly rendered in the *Heb. 2. Hebrews*, since the Greek does not say *μορφῇ ὁμοίαν*, but *κατ' εἰκόνα*, the Character of Substance.

And if he will peruse a farther discovery of his Error, and explanation of the Matter, let him read *Col. 1. 15. Who is the Image of the Invisible God.*

And because *G. W.* willing to bring this strange Doctrine to the cap-

capacity of the People, compar'd their three Persons to three Apostles, saying, he did not understand how *Paul, Peter, and John* could be three Persons, and one Apostle, (a most apt comparison to detect the *ridicule* of their Doctrine) one *Maddocks*; whose Zeal outstrip his knowledge, bustling hard, as one that had some necessary matter for the decision of our Controversie, instead thereof (perhaps to save his Brethren, or show himself) silences our farther controverting of the Principle, by a Syllogistical, but false and impertinent reflection upon *G. W.* his person. It runs thus, *He that scornfully and reproachfully compares our Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity of Father, Son, and Spirit; one in Essence, but three in Persons, to three since men, as Paul, Peter, and John, is a Blasphemer. But you G. W. have said so: Ergo*

A strange way of Argumentation, to beg what can't be granted him, and take for granted what still remains a Question, *viz.* That there are three distinct and separate Persons in one Essence: Let them first prove their Trinity, and then charge their Blasphemy; but I must not forget this persons self-confutation, who to be plainer, called them three *He's*; and if he can find a *He* without a Substance, or prove that a substance is any other than the form of a *He*, (he would do well to justify himself from the imputation of Ignorance,

And till their Hypothesis be of better Authority, *G. W.* neither did, nor does by that Comparison design mens Inventions so much honour.

For 'tis to be remark'd, that *G. W.* is no otherwise a Blasphemer, than by drawing direct consequences from their own Principles, and recharging them upon themselves; so that he did not speak his own apprehensions by his Comparison, but the sense of their Assertion, therefore Blasphemer and Blasphemy are their own.

The Trinity of Distinct and Separate Persons in the Unity of Essence, refuted from Scripture.

1 King. 8. **23.** **AND** he said, Lord God, there is no God like unto **THEE**: To whom then will ye liken **ME**? Or shall I be equal, saith the Holy **ONE**? — I am the Lord, and there is **NONE** else, there is no God besides **ME**. Thus saith the Lord thy Redeemer, the Holy **ONE** of Israel. I will also praise **THEE**, O my God; unto **THEE** will I sing, O Holy **ONE** of Israel. * Jehovah is **ONE**, and his Name **ONE**. Which with the Cloud of other Testimonies that might be urg'd, evidently demonstrate, that in the days of the first Covenant, and Prophets, but **ONE** was the Holy God, and God but **ONE**. — Again, And Jesus said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but **ONE**, and that is God. And this is Life Eternal, that they might know **THEE** (Father) the **ONLY** true God. Seeing it is **ONE** God that shall justify; There be gods many, but unto us there is but **ONE** God, the Father, of whom are all things. **ONE** God and Father who is above all things. For there is **ONE** God. To the **ONLY** Wise God be glory now and ever.

Jude 25. From all which I shall lay down this one Assertion, that the Testimonies of Scripture, both under the Law, and since the Gospel-Dispensation, declare **ONE** to be God, and God to be **ONE**, on which I shall raise this Argument;

If God, as the Scriptures testify, hath never been declar'd or believ'd, but as the Holy **ONE**, then will it follow, that God is not a Holy **THREE**, nor doth subsist in **THREE** distinct and separate Holy **ONES**; but the before-cited Scriptures undeniably prove that **ONE** is God, and God only is that Holy **ONE**; therefore he can't be divided into, or subsist in a Holy **THREE**, or **THREE** distinct and separate Holy **ONES**. — Neither can this receive the least prejudice from that frequent but impertinent distinction, that he is **ONE** in Substance, but **THREE** in Persons or Subsistences; since God.

God was not declared or believed incompletely, or without his substance; Nor did he require homage from his Creatures, as an incomplete or abstracted Being, but as God the Holy ONE; For so he should be manifested and worshipped without that which was absolutely necessary to himself; A most absurd Blasphemy.— So that either the Testimonies of the aforementioned Scriptures are to be believ'd concerning God, that he is intirely and completely, not abstractly and distinctly, the Holy ONE, or else their Authority to be denied by these Trinitarians; and on the contrary, if they pretend to credit their Holy Testimonies, they must necessarily conclude their kind of Trinity a Fiction.

Refuted from right Reason.

1. If there be three distinct and separate Persons, then three distinct and separate Substances, because every person is inseparable from its own Substance; and as there is no person that's not a Substance in common acceptation among men, so do the Scriptures plentifully agree herein; and since the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Spirit is God (which their Opinion necessitates them to confess) then unless the Father, Son, and Spirit, are three distinct Things, they must be three distinct Substances, and consequently three distinct Gods.

2. It's farther prov'd, if it be consider'd, that either the Divine Persons are finite or infinite; if the first, then something finite is inseparable to the infinite Substance, whereby something finite is in God; If the last, then three distinct Infinities, three Omnipotents, three Eternals, and so three Gods.

3. If each Person be God, and that God subsists in three Persons, then in each Person are three Persons or Gods; and from three, they will increase to nine, and so *ad infinitum*.

4. But if they shall deny the three Persons, or Subsistencies to be infinite (for so there would unavoidably be three Gods); it will follow that they must be finite, and so the absurdity is not abated from what it was; for that of one substance having three subsistencies, is not greater, then that an infinite Being should have three finite modes of subsisting. But though that mode which is finite

can't

can't answer to a Substance that's infinite, yet to say if we can make their Principle to approach common sense; Let's conceive that three persons, which may be finite separately, make up an infinite conjunctly; however this will follow, that they are no more incommunicable or separate, nor properly Subsistences, but a Substance; for the infinite Substance can't find a bottom or Substance in any one or two, therefore jointly. And here I am also willing to over-look finiteness in the Father, Son, and Spirit, which this Doctrine must suppose.

5. Again, if these three distinct Persons are one, with some one thing, as they say they are with the God-head, then are not they incommunicable among themselves; but so much the contrary, as to be one in the place of another; for if that the only God is the Father, and Christ be that only God, then is Christ the Father. So if that one God be the Son, and the Spirit that one God, then is the Spirit the Son, and so round. Nor is it possible to stop, or that it should be other wise, since if the Divine Nature be inseparable from the three Persons, or communicated to each, and each Person have the whole Divine Nature, then is the Son in the Father, and the Spirit in the Son, unless that the God-head be as incommunicable to the Persons, as they are reported to be amongst themselves; or that the three Persons have distinctly allotted them such a proportion of the Divine Nature, as is not communicable to each other; which is a like ridiculous and shameful. Much more might be said to manifest the gross contradiction of this Trinitarian Doctrine, as vulgarly receiv'd; but I must be brief.

Information and Caution.

Before I shall conclude this Head, it's requisite I should inform the Reader concerning it's Original; thou mayst assure thy self, it's not from the Scriptures, nor Reason, since so expressly repugnant; although all Broachers of their own Inventions strongly endeavour to reconcile them with their Holy Record. Know then, my Friend, 'twas born above three hundred years after the Ancient Gospel was declared; and that through the nice distinctions, and too daring curiosity of the Bishop of *Alexandria*, who being opposed by *Ar-*

rim,

rim, their Zeal so reciprocally blew the fire of Contention, Animosity, and Persecution, till at last they sacrific'd each other to their mutual revenge.

Thus it was conceiv'd in ignorance, brought forth and maintain'd by crueky; for though he that was strongest, impos'd his Opinion, persecuting the contrary, yet the Scale turning on the Trinitarian side, it has there continued through all the Romish Generations; and notwithstanding it hath obtain'd the name of *Athanasian* from *Athanasius*, an opinated man, (witness his carriage towards *Constantine* the Emperor) because suppos'd to have been most concern'd in the framing that Creed in which this Doctrine is asserted; yet have I never seen one Copy void of a suspicion, rather to have been the results of Popish School-men, which I could render more perspicuous, did not brevity necessitate me to an omission.

Be therefore caution'd, Reader, not to embrace the determinations of prejudic'd Councils, for Evangelical Doctrine; to whom the Scriptures bear no certain testimony, neither was believ'd by the Primitive Saints, or thus stated by any I have read in the first, second, or third Centuries, particularly *Irenaeus*, *Justin Martyr*, *Tertullian*, *Origen*, *Theophilact*, with many others who appear wholly foreign to the matter in controversy. — But seeing that private Spirits, and those none of the most ingenious, have been the Parents and Guardians of this so generally receiv'd Doctrine; let the time pass suffice, and be admonish'd to apply thy mind unto that Light and Grace which brings Salvation; that by obedience thereunto, those mists Tradition hath cast before thy eyes, may be expel'd, and thou receive a certain knowledge of that God, whom to know is Life Eternal, not to be a divided, but ONE pure intire and eternal Being; who in the fulness of time sent forth his Son, as the true Light which enlighteneth every man; that whosoever follow'd him (the Light) might be translated from the dark Notions, and vain Conversations of men, to this Holy Light, in which onely sound Judgment and eternal Life are obtainable; who so many hundred years since, in Person testified the virtue of it, and has communicated unto all, such a proportion, as may enable them to follow his Example.

The Vulgar Doctrine of Satisfaction, being dependent on the Second Person of the imagin'd Trinity, refuted from Scripture.

Doctr. **T**hat man having transgress'd the Righteous Law of God, and so expos'd to the penalty of eternal Wrath, it's altogether impossible for God to remit or forgive without a Plenary Satisfaction; and that there was no other way by which God could obtain satisfaction, or save men, than by inflicting the penalty of infinite wrath and vengeance on Jesus Christ the Second Person of the Trinity, who for sins past, present, and to come, hath wholly born and paid it, (whether for all or but some) to the offended infinite justice of his Father.

Exod. 34: 6, 7. 1. And the Lord passed by before him, (Moses) and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God merciful and gracious, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, transgression and sin: [From whence I shall draw this Position, that since God has proclaim'd himself a Gracious, Merciful, and forgiving God, it's not inconsistent with his Nature to remit, without any other consideration than his own Love; otherwise he could not justly come under the imputation of so many gracious *Attributes*, with whom it is impossible to pardon, and necessary to exact the payment of the utmost farthing.]—

2 Chron. 33. 2. For if ye turn again to the Lord, the Lord your God is gracious and merciful, and will not turn away his face from you. [Where how natural is it to observe that God's remission is grounded on their repentance; and not that it's impossible for God to pardon, without a Plenary satisfaction, since the possibility, nay, certainty of the contrary, viz. his Grace and Mercy, is the great Motive or Reason of that loving invitation to return.]—

Neh. 9: 3. They hardened their Necks, and hearkned not to thy Commandments, but thou art a God ready to pardon, gracious and merciful.

[Can

[Can the honest-hearted Reader conceive, that God should be thus mercifully qualified, whilst executing the rigor of the Law transgress, or not acquitting without the Debt be paid him by another? I suppose not.

4. *Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts: and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him, and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.* [Come let the unprejudiced judge, if this Scripture-Doctrine is not very remote from saying his Nature cannot forgive sin, therefore let Christ pay him full satisfaction, or he will certainly be avenged; which is the substance of that strange Opinion.] *Isa. 55.*

5. *Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a New Covenant with the House of Israel: I will put my Law in their inward Parts: I will forgive their iniquity, I will remember their sin no more.* [Here is God's meer Grace asserted, against the pretended necessity of a satisfaction to procure his Remission: And this Paul acknowledgeth to be the dispensation of the Gospel, in his eighth Chapter to the *Hebrews*. So that this New Doctrine doth not only contradict the Nature and Design of the second Covenant, but seems in short to discharge God both from his Mercy and Omnipotence.] *Jer. 31. 32, 33, 34.*

6. *Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth Mich. 7. by the transgression of the Remnant of his Heritage? He retaineth not his Anger for ever, because he delighteth in Mercy.* [Can there be a more express passage to clear, not only the possibility, but real inclinations in God to pardon sin, and not retain his anger for ever; since the Prophet seems to challenge all other Gods to try their excellency by his God, herein describing the supremacy of his Power, and superexcellency of his Nature, that he pardoneth iniquity, and retaineth not his anger for ever: so that if the Satisfactionists should ask the Question, Who is a God like unto ours, that cannot pardon iniquity, nor pass by transgression, but retain his anger until some-body make him satisfaction? I answer, Many amongst the harsh and severe Rulers of the Nations; but as for my God, he is exalted above them all, upon the Throne of his Mercy, who pardoneth iniquity, and retaineth not his anger for ever, but will have compassion upon us.]

Mat. 6. 7. *And forgive us our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors.* Where
12. nothing can be more obvious than that which is forgiven is not paid.

And if it is our duty to forgive without a satisfaction received, and that God is to forgive us as we forgive them, then is a satisfaction totally excluded. Christ further paraphrases upon that part of his Prayer, v. 12. *For if ye forgive their trespasses, your Heavenly Father will also forgive you.* Where he as well argues the equity of God's forgiving them, from their forgiving others, as he encourages them to forgive others, from the example of God's Mercy in forgiving them; which is more amply express in chap. 18. where the Kingdom of Heaven (that consists in Reconciliation) is represented by a King, *Who upon the Duke's Petition, had compassion, and forgave him; but the same treating his fellow Servant without the least forbearance, the King condemned his ungratefulness, and delivered him over to the Tormentors.* But how had this been a fault in the Servant, if his King's Mercy had not been proposed for his Example? How most unworthy therefore is it of God, and blasphemous, may I justly learn it, to be in any, daring to ascribe that forgiveness impossible to God, which is not only possible, but enjoyn'd to men.]

John 3. 8. *For God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believed in him, should not perish, but have everlasting Life.* [By which it appears, that God's Love is not the effect of Christ's satisfaction, but Christ is the proper Gift and Effect of God's Love.]

Act. 10. 34. *To him gave all the Prophets witness, that through his Name whosoever believeth in him, shall receive Remission of sins.* [So that Remission came by believing his Testimony, and obeying his Precepts, and not by a pretended satisfaction.]

Rom. 8. 31, 32. *If God be for us, who can be against us? He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all.* [Which evidently declares it to be God's Act of free Love, otherwise if he must be paid; he should be, at the charge of his own satisfaction, for he delivered up the Son.]

2 Cor. 12 5-18, 19. *And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the Ministry of Reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ, reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.* [How undeniably apparent is it that God is so far from standing off in high displeasure, and upon his

(17)
his feelings, contracting with his Son for a satisfaction, as being otherwise incapable to be reconciled, that he became himself the Reconciler by Christ, and afterwards by the Apostles, his Ambassadors, to whom was committed the Ministry of Reconciliation.]

12. In whom we have redemption through his Blood, the forgiveness Eph. 1. 7 of sins, according to the riches of his grace. [Now what relation, satisfaction has to forgiveness of sins, or how any can construe Grace to be Justice, the meanest understanding may determine.]

13. But the God of all Grace, who hath called us unto his eternal 1 Pet. 5. Glory, by Christ Jesus. [He does not say that God's Justice, in consideration of Christ's Satisfaction, acquitted us from sins past, present, and to come, and therefore hath called us to his eternal Glory, but from his Grace.]

14. In this was manifested the love of God towards us, because that 1 John 4. 9 God sent his only begotten Son into the World, that we might live through him. [Which plainly attributes Christ in his Doctrine, Life, Miracles, Death, and Sufferings to God, as the Gift and Expression of his Eternal Love, for the Salvation of men.]

1. In abolishing that other Covenant, which consisted in External and shadowy Ordinances, and that made none clean as concerning the Conscience.

2. In promulgating his message of a most free and universal tender of Life and Salvation unto all that believed and followed him, (the Light) in all his Righteousness, the very end of his appearance being to destroy the works of the Devil, and which every man only comes to experiment; as he walks in a holy subjection to that measure of Light and Grace; wherewith the fullness hath enlightened him.

3. In seconding his Doctrines with Signs, Miracles, and a most innocent self-denying life.

4. In ratifying and confirming all (with great love, and holy resignation) by the offering up of his Body to be crucified by wicked hands; who is now ascended far above all Heavens, and is thereby become a most compleat Captain, and perfect Example.

So that I can by no means conclude, but openly declare that the Scriptures of Truth are not only silent in reference to this Doctrine of Satisfaction, but that it's altogether inconsistent with the Dignity of God, and very repugnant to the Conditions, Nature, and

(5)
Tendency of the second Covenant, concerning which their Testimony is so clear.

The Absurdities, that unavoidably follow the Comparison of this Doctrine, with the sense of Scripture.

1. **T**hat God is gracious to forgive, and yet impossible for him, unless the Debt be fully satisfied.
2. That the finite and impotent Creature, is more capable of extending Mercy and Forgiveness, than the Infinite and Omnipotent Creator.
3. That God so loved the World, he gave his only Son to save it; and yet that God stood off in high displeasure, and Christ gave himself to God as a compleat satisfaction to his offended Justice; with many more such like gross Consequences that might be drawn.

Refuted from right Reason.

But if we should grant a Scripture-silence as to the necessity of Christ's satisfying his Fathers Justice, yet so manifest would be the Contradictions, and foul the Repugnances to right Reason, that who had not vail'd his understanding with the dark suggestions of unwarrantable Tradition, or contracted his Judgment to the implicit apprehensions of some over-valued acquaintance, might with great facility discriminate to a full resolve in this point; for admitting God to be a Creditor, or he to whom the Debt should be paid, and Christ he that satisfies or payes it on the behalf of man, the Debtor, this question will arise, Whether he paid that Debt, as God, Man, or both (to use their own terms.)

No

Not as God.

1. In that it divides the Unity of the God-head by two distinct Acts, of being Offended, and not Offended; of condemning Justice, and redeeming by Mercy of requiring a satisfaction, and then paying of it.

2. Because if Christ payes the Debt as God, then the Father and the Spirit being God, they also pay the Debt.

3. Since God is to be satisfied, and that Christ is God, he consequently is to be satisfied; and who shall satisfy his infinite Justice?

4. But if Christ has satisfied God the Father, Christ being also God, 'twill follow then that he has satisfied himself, (which can't be.)

5. But since God the Father was once to be satisfied, and that it's impossible he should do it himself, nor yet the Son or Spirit, because the same God; it naturally follows that the Debt remains unpaid, and these Satisfactionists thus far are still at a loss.

Not as Man.

6. The Justice offended, being infinite, his satisfaction ought to bear a proportion therewith, which Jesus Christ, as Man, could never pay, he being finite, and from a finite cause could not proceed an infinite effect; for so man may be said to bring forth God, since nothing below the Divinity it self can rightly be stiled Infinite.

Not as God and Man.

7. For where two mediums, or middle Propositions, are singly inconsistent with the nature of the end for which they were at first propounded, their conjunction rather does augment than lessen the difficulty of its accomplishment; and this I am perswaded must be obvious to every unbiass'd understanding.

But

But admitting one of these three mediums possible for the payment of an infinite Debt; yet, pray observe the most unworthy, and ridiculous consequences that unavoidably will attend the impossibility of Gods pardoning sinners without a satisfaction.

Consequences Irreligious and Irrational.

1. That it's unlawful and impossible for God Almighty to be Gracious and Merciful, or to pardon Transgressors; then which, what's more unworthy of God?

2. That God was inevitably compel'd to this way of saving men; the highest affront to his incontrolable Nature.

3. That it was unworthy of God to pardon, but not to inflict punishment on the Innocent, or require satisfaction where there was nothing due.

4. It doth not onely disacknowledge the true Virtue, and real Intent of Christ's life and death, but intirely deprives God of that praise which is owing to his greatest love and goodness.

5. It represents the Son more kind and compassionate than the Father; whereas if both be the same God, then either the Father is as loving as the Son, or the Son as angry as the Father.

6. It robs God of the gift of his Son for our Redemption (which the Scriptures attribute to the unmerited love he had for the World) in affirming the Son purchas'd that Redemption from the Father, by the gift of himself to God as our compleat satisfaction.

7. Since Christ could not pay what was not his own, it follows that in the payment of his own, the case still remains equally grievous; Since the Debt is not hereby absolv'd or forgiven, but transfer'd only; and by consequence we are no better provided for Salvation than before, owing that now to the Son, which was once owing to the Father.

8. It no way renders men beholding, or in the least oblig'd to God, since by their Doctrine he would not have abated us, nor did he Christ the last farthing, so that the acknowledgments are peculiarly the Sons: which destroys the whole current of Scripture-Testimony, for his good will towards men.— O the infamous portraiture this Doctrine draws of the infinite Goodness: Is this your retribution, O injurious Satisfactionists?

9. That

(53)

9. That God's Justice is satisfied for sins past, present, and to come, whereby God and Christ have lost both their power of injoyning Godliness, and prerogative of punishing Disobedience; for what is once paid, is not revokeable; and if punishment should arrest any for their Debts, it either argues a breach on God or Christs part, or else that it has not been sufficiently solv'd, and the penalty completely sustain'd by an other; forgetting that every one must appear before the Judgment Seat of Christ, to receive according to things done in the body: Yea, every one must give an account of himself to God. 2 Cor. 13. 10. But many more are the gross Absurdities and Blasphemies that are the genuine Fruits of this so confidently believed Doctrine of Satisfaction.

A Caution.

Let me advise, nay warn thee, Reader, by no means to admit an entertainment of this Principle, by whomsoever recommended; since it does not only divest the glorious God of his sovereign Power, both to pardon and punish, but as certainly insinuates a licentiousness, at least a liberty that unbecomes the nature of that antient Gospel once preached among the Primitive Saints, and that from an apprehension of a satisfaction once paid for all. Whereas I must tell thee, That unless thou seriously repent, and no more grieve God's Holy Spirit, placed in thy inmost Parts, but art thereby taught to deny all ungodliness, and lead into all Righteousness; At the Tribunal of the Great Judge thy Plea shall prove invalid, and thou receive thy reward without respect to any other thing than the Deeds done in the Body. *Be not deceived, God will not be mocked; such as thou sowest, such shalt thou reap:* which leads me to the consideration of my third Head, viz. Justification by an Imputative Righteousness. Gal. 6. 7.

The

(24)

The Justification of impure Persons, by an imputative Righteousness, refuted from Scripture.

Doctr. **T**hat there is no other way for sinners to be justified in the sight of God, than by the imputation of that Righteousness Christ long since performed Personally, and that Sanctification is consequential, not antecedent.

Exod. 23. 1. **1.** *Keep thee far from a false matter; and the Innocent and Righteous slay thou not; for I will not justify the wicked.* Whereon I ground this Argument. That since God has prescribed an inoffensive life, as that which only can give acceptance with him, and on the contrary hath determined never to justify the wicked, then will it necessarily follow, that unless this so much believ'd imputative Righteousness had that effectual influence, as to regenerate and redeem the Soul from sin, on which the malediction lies, he is as far to seek for justification as before; for whilst a person is really guilty of a false matter, I positively assert from the authority and force of this Scripture, they cannot be in a state of Justification; and as God will not justify the Wicked, so by the acknowledg'd reason of contraries, the Just he will never condemn, but they, and they only are the justified of God.

Prov. 17. 15. **2.** *He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are an abomination to the Lord.* [It would very opportunely be observ'd, that if its so great an abomination in men to justify the Wicked, and condemn the Just, how much greater would it be in God, which this Doctrine of Imputative Righteousness necessarily does imply, that so far disengages God from the person justified, as that his guilt shall not condemn him, nor his innocency justify him? but will not the abomination appear greatest of all, when God shall be found condemning of the Just, on purpose to justify the Wicked, and that he is there to compel, or else no Salvation,

tion: which is the tendency of their Doctrine, *Who imagine the Righteous and Merciful God, to condemn and punish his Innocent Son, that he having satisfied for our sins, we might be justified (whilst un sanctified) by the imputation of his perfect Righteousness.* O why should this horrible thing be contended for by Christians?

3. *The Son shall not bear the iniquity of his Father; the Righteousness of the Righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him. When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die; again when the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness, and doth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his Soul alive; yet saith the House of Israel, The Ways of the Lord are not equal; Are not my Ways equal?* If this was once equal, it's so still, for Gods unchangeable; and therefore I shall draw this Argument, That the condemnation or justification of persons is not from the imputation of an others Righteousness, but the actual performance and keeping of God's Righteous Statutes or Commandments, otherwise God should forget to be equal: Therefore how wickedly unequal are those, who not from Scripture evidences, but their dark conjectures and interpretations of obscure passages, would frame a Doctrine so manifestly inconsistent with God's most pure and equal Nature; making him to condemn the Righteous to death, and justify the wicked to life, from the imputation of an others Righteousness: — a most unequal way indeed.

4. *Not every one that saith unto me Lord Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father. Who ever heareth these sayings of mine, and doth them, I will liken him unto a wise man which built his house upon a Rock, &c.* [How very fruitful are the Scriptures of Truth in Testimonies against this absurd and dangerous Doctrine; these words seem to import a twofold Righteousness, the first consists in Sacrifice, the last in Obedience; the one makes a talking, the other a doing Christian. I in short argue thus, If none can enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, but they that do the Fathers Will; then none are justified, but they who do the Fathers Will, because none can enter into the Kingdom, but such as are justified; since therefore there can be no admittance had without performing that Righteous Will, and doing those Holy and perfect Sayings. Alas, to what value will an Imputative Righteousness

redoublers amount when a poor Soul shall awake polluted in his sin, by the hasty calls of death, to make its appearance before the Judgment Seat, where 'tis impossible to justify the wicked, or that any should escape uncondemned, but such as do the Will of G. 1.]

John's. 5. *If ye keep my Commandments, ye shall abide in my love, even as I have kept my Father's Commandments, and abide in his love.* [From

10.

whence this Argument doth naturally arise; If none are truly justified that abide not in Christ's love, and that none abide in his love who keep not his Commandments, then consequently none are justified but such as keep his Commandments. Besides, here is the most palpable opposition to an Imputative Righteousness that may be; for Christ is so far from telling them of such a way of being justified, as that he informs them the reason why he abode in his Father's love, was his obedience, and is so far from telling them of their being justified whilst not abiding in his love, by virtue of his obedience imputed unto them, that unless they keep his Commands, and obey for themselves, they shall be so remote from an acceptance, as wholly to be cast out; in all which Christ is but our Example.]

John's. 14. *Ye are my Friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.* [We

14.

have almost here the very words, but altogether the same matter, which affords us thus much, without being Christ's Friend, there's no being justified; but unless we keep his Commandments, it's impossible we should be his Friends; it therefore necessarily follows, that except we keep his Commandments, there is no being justified: or in short this, If the way to be a Friend, is to keep the Commandments, then the way to be justified is to keep the Commandments, because none can obtain the quality of a Friend, and remain unjustified, or be truly justified, whilst an Enemy, which he certainly is, that keeps not his Commandments.]

Rom. 2. 13. *For not the hearers of the Law are just before God, but the doers of the Law shall be justified.* [From whence how unanswerably may I observe, Unless ye become doers of that Law, which Christ came

13.

not to destroy, but as our Example, to fulfil, we can never be justified before God; wherefore obedience is so absolutely necessary, that short of it there can be no acceptance; nor let any fancy that Christ had so fulfilled it for them, as to exclude their obedience from being requisite to their acceptance, but only as their Pattern, For unless ye follow me, saith Christ, ye cannot be my Disciples; and

and

and it is not only repugnant to Reason, but in this place particularly refuted; for if Christ had fulfilled it on our behalf, and we not enabled to follow his Example, there would not be doers, but one doer only of the Law justified before God. In short, if without obedience to the Righteous Law none can be justified, then all the hearing of the Law, with but the meer imputation of anothers Righteousness, whilst actually a breaker of it, is excluded as not justifying before God. *If you fulfil the Royal Law, ye do well; so speak ye, and so do; as they that shall be judged thereby.*

8. *If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortifie the deeds of the Body, ye shall live.* [No man can be dead and justified before God, for so He may be justified that lives after the flesh; therefore they only can be justified that are alive; from whence this follows, If the living are justified and not the dead, and that none can live to God, but such as have mortified the deeds of the Body through the Spirit, then none can be justified but they who have mortified the deeds of the Body through the Spirit; so that Justification does not go before, but is subsequential to the mortification of lusts, and sanctification of the Soul through the Spirits operation.] Rom. 8. 13.

9. *For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, are the Sons of God.* [How clearly will it appear to say but a cavelling and tenacious Spirit, that man can be no farther justified, then as he becomes obedient to the Spirits leadings; for if none can be a Son of God, but he that is led by the Spirit of God, then none can be justified without being led by the Spirit of God, because none can be justified but he that is a Son of God: so that the way to Justification and Son-ship, is through obedience to the Spirits leadings, that is; manifesting the holy Fruits thereof by an innocent life and conversation.] Rom. 8. 14.

10. *But as every man reaps his own work; and thus shall be happy that sows to himself alone, and not in another. Be not deceived, for whatsoever a man sows, that shall he reap.* [If rejoicing and acceptance with God, or the contrary, are to be reaped from the work that a man sows, either to the Flesh or to the Spirit, then is the Doctrine of Acceptance, and ground of Rejoicing from the works of another utterly excluded, every man reaping according to what he hath sown, and bearing his own burden.] Gal. 6. 7.

Jam. 2. 21, 24. **21.** Was not Abraham our Father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his Son upon the Altar? **To see when how that by works a man is justified, and not by Faith only.** [He that will seriously peruse this Chapter, shall doubtless find some, to whom this Epistle was wrote, of the same Spirit with the Satisfactionists and Imputarians of our time; they say would have found out a Justification from Faith in, & the Imputation of anothers Righteousness; but James an Apostle of the most high God, who experimentally knew what true Faith and Justification meant, gave them to understand from *Abrahams* self-denying Example, that unless their Faith in the purity and power of God's Grace, had that effectual Operation to subdue every beloved lust, wean from every *Dallila*, and intirely to resign and sacrifice *Isaac* himself, their Faith was a Fable, or as a Body without a Spirit; and as Righteousness therefore in one person cannot justifie another from unrighteousness, so whoever now pretends to be justified by Faith, whilst not led and guided by the Spirit into all the Wayes of Truth, and Works of Righteousness, their Faith they will find at last Fiction.]

2 John 3-7, 8. **12.** Little Children; **Doth** man deceive you, **by that doth Righteousness, is Righteous, as God is Righteous, (but) he that committeth sin is of the Devil.** [From whence it may be very clearly argued, that none can be in a state of Justification from the Righteousness performed by an other imputed unto them, but as they are actually redeemed from the commission of sin. For if he that commits sin is of the Devil, then cannot any be justified completely before God, who is so incompletely redeem'd, as yet, to be under the captivity of lust; since then the Devil's Seed or Off-spring may be justified, but that's impossible; It there follows, that as he who doth Righteousness, is Righteous, as God is Righteous; so no farther is he like God, or justifiable; for in whatsoever he derogates from the works of that Faith, which is held in a pure Conscience, he is no longer Righteous or justifi'd, but under condemnation as a Transgressor, or disobedient person to the Righteous Commandment; and if any would obtain the true state of Justification, let them circumspectly observe the Holy Guidelines and Instructions of that Union; to which the Apostle recommended the Ancient Churches, that thereby they may be led out of all ungodliness into Truth and Holiness; so shall they find acceptance with the Lord, who has determined never to justify the wicked.]

Resu.

Refuted from right Reason.

1. Because it's impossible for God to justify that which is both opposite and destructive to the purity of his own Nature, as this Doctrine necessarily obliges him to do in accepting the wicked, as not such from the imputation of anothers Righteousness.

2. Since man was justified before God, whilst in his native Innocency, and never condemned till he had er'd from that pure state; he never can be justified, whilst in the frequent Commission of that for which the Condemnation came; therefore to be justified, his Redemption must be as intire as his fall.

3. Because sin came not by Imputation, but actual Transgression; for God did not condemn his Creature for what he did not, but what he did, therefore must the Righteousness be as personal for acceptance, otherwise these two things will necessarily follow, first, that he may be actually a sinner, and yet not under the curse; secondly, That the power of the first *Adam* to death, was more prevalent then the power of the second *Adam* unto life.

4. Its therefore contrary to sound reason, that if actual sinning brought death and condemnation, any thing besides actual obedience unto Righteousness, should bring Life and Justification; for Death and Life, Condemnation and Justification, being vastly opposite, no man can be actually dead and imputatively alive; therefore this Doctrine so much contended for, carries this grois absurdity with it, that a man may be actually sinful, yet imputatively righteous; actually judged and condemned, yet imputatively justified and glorified. In short, he may be actually damned, and yet imputatively saved; otherwise it must be acknowledged that obedience to Justification ought to be as personally extensive as was disobedience to condemnation: In which real, not imputative sense, those various terms of Sanctification, Righteousness, Resurrection, Life, Redemption, Justification, &c. are most infallibly to be understood?

5. Nor are their words, *Impute*, *Imputed*, *Imputation*, *Imputing*, used in Scripture by way of application, to that which is actual and inherent, as the Asserters of an Imputative Righteousness do by their Doctrine plainly intimate; but so much the contrary, as that they

are.

are never mentioned but to express men really and personally to be that which is imputed to them, whether as guilty, as remitted, or as righteous: for instance, *What was the charge of the house of Israel that kill'd an Ox, and bringeth it not to the door of the Tabernacle, to offer unto the Lord, Blood shall be imputed unto that man, or charged upon him as guilty thereof. And Shimei said unto the King, Let not my Lord impute Iniquity unto me, for thy servant doth know that I have sinned.*

13. *Rom. 5. 6. But this is not imputed where there is no Law.* From whence it is apparent that there could be no imputation or charging of guilt upon any but such as really were guilty. Next, it is used about Remission: *Psal. 32. Bless'd the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity;* or as the foregoing words have it, *Where the transgression is forgiven.* Where the non-imputation doth not argue a non-reality of sin, but the reality of God's pardon; for otherwise there would be nothing to forgive, not yet a real pardon, but only imputative, which according to the sense of this Doctrine I call *Imaginary*. Again, *God was in Christ reconciling the World unto himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them.* Where also non-imputation, being a real discharge for actual trespasses, argues an imputation by the reason of contraries, to be a real charging of actual guilt. Lastly, *2 Cor. 5. it's used in relation to Righteousness; Was not Abraham justified by works when he offered Isaac unto the Lord?* *Jam. 2. Works not Faith made perfect, and the Scripture was fulfilled, which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for Righteousness.* By which we must not conceive, as do the dark Impugners of this age, that *Abraham's* offering personally was not a justifying righteousness, but that God was pleas'd to account it so; since God never accounts a thing that which it is not; nor was there an imputation of anothers righteousness to *Abraham*, but on the contrary, his personal obedience was the ground of that just imputation; and therefore that any should be justified from the imputation of anothers righteousness, not inherent, or actually possessed by them, is both ridiculous and dangerous: Ridiculous, since it is to say a man is rich to the value of a thousand pounds, whilst he is not really or personally worth a groat, from the imputation of another who has it all in his possession: Dangerous, because it begets confident persuasion in many people of their being justified, whilst in captivity to those lusts, whose reward

ward is condemnation; whence came that usual saying amongst many Professors of Religion, *That God looks not on them as they are in themselves, but as they are in Christ*; not considering that none can be in Christ, who are not new Creatures, which thole can't be reputed, who have not disrob'd themselves of their old Garments, but are still immanced with the corruptions of the old man.

Consequences Irreligious and Irrational. **T**

1. It makes God guilty of what the Scriptures say is an abomination, to wit, that he justifieth the wicked.
2. It makes him look upon persons of very different respects, which is unworthy of his most equal Nature.
3. He is hereby at peace with the wicked, (as justified whilst sinners) who said, *There is no peace to the wicked*.
4. It does only imply communion with them here, in an imperfect state, but so to all eternity, for *whom he justified, them he also* Rom. 8. *glorified*. Therefore whom he justified, whilst sinners, them he also glorified whilst sinners.
5. It only secures from the wages, not the dominion of sin, whereby something that is sinful becomes justified, and that which defileth to enter God's Kingdom.
6. It renders a man justified and condemned, dead and alive; redeemed and not redeemed at the same time, the one by an imputative Righteousness, the last by a personal unrighteousness.
7. It flatters men, whilst subject to the World's lusts, with a state of justification, and thereby invalids the very act of Christ's appearance, which was to destroy the works of the Devil, and take away the sin of the World; a quite contrary picture then what the Satisfactionists, and Imputationists of some Times have imagin'd, viz. to justify their sins, and by his Imputed Righteousness, to represent them holy in him, whilst unholy in themselves. Therefore once it was to take away sin, and destroy the Devils works, which were not in himself, for that Holy One had no corruption, consequently in one kind, what are therefore be concluded more evidently true, then that such in whom sin is broken away, and the Devils works undestroyed, are strangers (notwithstanding.

[32]

standing their conceits) to the very end and purpose of Christs manifestation.

Conclusion by way of Caution.

Thus Reader have I lead thee through these three so generally applauded Doctrines, whose confutation, I hope, though thou hast run, thou hast read; and now I call the Righteous God of Heaven to bear me Record, that I have herein sought nothing below the defence of his Unity, Mercy, and Purity against the rude and impetuous assaults of Tradition, Press and Pulpit, from whence I daily hear, what rationally induceth me to believe a conspiracy is held by Counter-plots, to obstruct the exaltation of Truth, and to betray Evangelical Doctrines, to Idle Traditions: But God will rebuke the Winds, and destruction shall attend the Enemies of his Anointed.

Mistake me not, we never have disowned a Father, Word, and Spirit, which are ONE, but mens Inventions; for,

1. Their Trinity has not so much as a Foundation in the Scriptures.
2. That its Original was three hundred years after Christianity was in the World.
3. It having cost much Blood, in the Council

Socrat. of Sirminum, Anno 355. it was Decreed, *This therefore the contrivance should not once be remembered, because the Scriptures of God an. 355. made no mention thereof.* Why then should it be mentioned now with

Conc. a Maranatha, on all that will not bow to this arbitrary Opinion, Sirm.

cap. 25. Images of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, 5. It scandalizeth Turks, p. 275. Jews, and Infidels; and palpably obstructs their reception of the

Christian Doctrine, Not to there more to be said on the behalf of the other two; for I can boldly Challenge any person to

give me one Scripture Phrase which does approach the Doctrine of Satisfaction; (much less the Name) considering to what degree it is

frustrated; not that we do deny, but really confess that Jesus Christ in Life, Doctrine, and Death, suffered his Fathers Will, and offered up a most satisfactory Sacrifice, but not to pay God, or help

him (as otherwise being unable) to save men, and for a justifica-

tion; signifi- cation

tion by an Imputative Righteousness, whilst not real, it's merely an
 imagination, not a reality, and therefore rejected; otherwise con-
 fess and known to be justifying before God; because there is no a-
 biding in Christ's Love, without keeping his Commandments. I
 therefore caution thee in love, of whatsoever Tribe or Family of Re-
 ligion thou mayest be, not longer to deceive thy self by the over-
 fond imbraces of humane apprehensions, for Divine Mysteries; but
 rather be informed that God hath bestowed a measure of his Grace
 on thee and me, to shew us *what is good, that we may obey and do*
it; which if thou diligently wilt observe, thou shalt be led out of
 all unrighteousness, and in thy obedience shalt thou *receive power*
to become a Son of God; in which happy estate God only can be known
 by men, and they know themselves to be justified before him, whom
 experimentally to know, by *Jesus Christ, is life Eternal.*

*A Post-script of Animadversions upon T. V's Contra-
 dictions, delivered in his Sermon from 1. John 5.
 4. at his evening Lecture in Spittle-Yard;*

*For whatsoever is born of God, over-
 cometh the World.*

<p>W <i>Hatsoever Person is born of God, overcometh the world.</i></p>	<p><i>There is a two-fold Victory; Doctr. the first Compleat, the second In- compleat.</i></p>
---	--

This is as well a contradiction to his Text and Doctrine, as com- *Animad*
 mon sense; for besides that they neither of them say, He that's born
 of God, cannot perfectly overcome the World, but much the contra-
 ry; I am would understand his intention by an incompleat victo-
 ry: If he means not such a one as is obtained by the slaughter of
 every individual, but that which onely does subdue the force and
 lead captive their enemies, yet will the Victory prove compleat; for
 if they be so far overcome as to be disarmed of farther power to mil-
 chieve;

chieve, the dispute is properly determined: but whatsoever is incomplete, is but overcoming, or in the way to victory, and victory is the completing of what was before imperfect.

Cont.

Such overcome as are born again, who are in Christ, that have cast off the old Man, and known a change altogether new. | Worldly lusts can't be extirpated out of God's People in this World.

Anim.

If sin must have a place in them, how can they be born of God, and have a place in Christ, or cast off the old man, and know a change altogether new?

Cont.

God's Children are the greatest Conquerors; Alexander and Caesar were Conquerors, but these overcome their lusts. | God's Children can't perfectly overcome the lusts of the World, they sometimes take them captive.

Anim.

What strange Divinity is this! that God's People should be Conquerors, and yet Captives; overcome the World, and yet be overcome thereby.

Cont.

Sin may tyrannize over Believers. | But not have dominion; it's in captivity, it's in chains.

Anim.

Who is so absolutely injurious and incontrollable, as a Tyrant? and notwithstanding that he should have no dominion, but be in captivity, and in chains, at best are Bedlam distinctions, and consequently unworthy of any mans mouth that has a share of common sense.

Cont.

You must kill or be kill'd; either you must overcome the World, or the World you. | 2. Incompletely, he overcomes, when he breaks their force, leads them captive, and puts them into chains; but they are not at all slain, they sometimes take him captive.

To kill or be kill'd, admits no middle way to escape; yet that *Anim.*
both Sin and Gods Children should lead one another captive; and
that he which fights shall overcome, and yet in danger of being led
captive; because incompletely a Conqueror; to me seems very
strange Doctrine.

However he goes on to tell them, *Whoever is born of God, over-*
comes the lusts of the World; and he that overcomes the lusts of the
World, overcomes the Devil of Hell: Gods Children have to do with
a conquered Enemy. Yet he would all this while be understood
in an incomplete sense; and to excite all to fight for this incomplete
Victory, he recommended to their consideration the excellent rewards
of Conquerors, that is, *To him that overcometh, will I give to eat of*
the Tree of Life, the hidden Manna. I will give him a white
Stone, a new Name, Power over Nations, white Rayment; yea, I
will make him a Pillar in the Temple of my God; he shall go no more
out, and I will grant him to sit with me in my Throne. Admirable
priviledges, I acknowledge! but are they promis'd to incomplete Con-
querors? I judge not. Reader, by this thou mayest be able to give
a probable conjecture of the rest; and as I have begun with him and
his Co-disputants, with them I'll end, who notwithstanding all
their boasts and calumnies against us, have so evaded those many op-
portunities we have offered them by Letters, Verbal Messages, and
Personal Visits, that had they any Zeal for their Principles, love for
their Reputation, or Conscience in their Promises, they would have
been induc'd to a more direct and candid Treaty.

But as it hath occasioned the publication of this little Treatise, so
am I credibly inform'd, through the too busie and malicious inquisi-
tion of some concerning it, (which have amounted to no less than pos-
sitive Reports) its currantly discours'd, *How that a certain Qua-*
ker hath lately espous'd the controversie against R. F. and therein has
perverted the Christian Religion, to that degree, as plainly to deny
Christs coming in the flesh; with much more then was fit to be said,
or is fit to be answered.

But Reader, I shall ask no other Judge to clear me from that most
uncharitable accusation, since first I am altogether unacquainted
with R. F. nor never did design directly such a thing, being unwill-
ing to seek more Adversaries than what more nearly seek the over-
throw of Truth, although I doubt not but this plain and simple

